

Amendments to the Drawings

Fig. 6 has been corrected to correspond to the specification and to be consistent with originally filed Fig. 6. In particular, certain characteristic terms are shown in a greater character size than other characteristic terms.

Attachments: Replacement Sheet

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

Claims 7-9 and 13-15 remain pending in this application. Claims 1-6 and 10-12 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. New claims 13-15 have been added.

Priority

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's acknowledgment of the claim for priority and safe receipt of the priority document.

Drawings

Fig. 6 has been corrected to correspond to the specification and to be consistent with originally filed Fig. 6. In particular, certain characteristic terms should be displayed in a greater character size than other characteristic terms (see specification, page 16, lines 3-8 and originally filed Fig. 6). No new matter has been added.

Claim Suggestions

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's suggestion for amendment of claims 1-5 and 11-12. However, these suggestions have been rendered moot by the cancellation of those claims without prejudice or disclaimer.

35 U.S.C. §101

The Examiner's rejections under this section have also been rendered moot by the cancellation of the rejected claims without prejudice or disclaimer.

35 U.S.C. §§102 and 103

Claims 1-3 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Anderson (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0102958). Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Miller et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,926,811). Claims 5 and 10-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Aggarwal et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,728,706). Claims 4 and 7-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson in view of Aggarwal et al. These rejections are traversed as follows.

Due to the cancellation of claims 1-6 and 10-12 without prejudice or disclaimer, Applicants address the outstanding rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 based on a combination of Anderson in view of Aggarwal et al. The present invention is directed to a method and system for retrieving documents in which a seed document that is created by a user is used to perform a search (Fig. 4) and the results of the search are output to a concept search trainer screen (Fig. 5). At this stage, a user can identify the relevant retrieved documents. Once these documents are identified, a comparison is made between the words (first characteristic terms) selected or

additionally entered by a user when the seed document was created against the words (second characteristic terms) that are extracted from user-selected documents when the concept search trainer screen of Fig. 5 was presented to the user. The new characteristic terms are shown in Fig. 6 with larger characters. The user can then select which words will not be used as characteristic terms for the next search. Finally, as shown in Fig. 7, the training result screen is shown in which arrows appear to the left of newly ranked documents (i.e., showing either increasing relevance or decreasing relevance).

On the other hand, Anderson merely discloses, in Fig. 7, a comparison of two different paragraphs generated by a longest common subsequence algorithm. Therefore, Anderson does not disclose any comparison of first characteristic terms and second characteristic terms. If the second characteristic terms are supposed to be the terms that differ between one paragraph and another paragraph, then they cannot be said to be the second characteristic terms which are entered by the user in accordance with the result of the search process. Further, these second characteristic terms are clearly not entered by indicating items shown on a screen displaying the results of the search on the first characteristic terms.

The deficiencies in Anderson are not overcome by resort to Aggarwal et al. Aggarwal et al disclose the using of relevance feedback and/or product redefinition to learn an "implied concept" of a shopper's stated product requirements. Aggarwal et al neither disclose nor suggest the selection and comparison between first


characteristic terms and second characteristic terms as recited in the pending claims.
As such, it is submitted that the pending claims patentably define the present
invention over the cited art.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of
Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.

By 
Shrinath Malur
Reg. No. 34,663
(703) 684-1120